

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/911,963	07/23/2001	James B. Terry	1391-10210	7967	
23505 75	10/28/2003		EXAMINER		
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.			LEE, JONG SUK		
P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3673	3673	
			DATE MAILED. 10/20/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/911,963	TERRY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Jong-Suk (James) Lee	3673				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 S</u>	September 2003 .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Thi	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-3,7,10-13,15,17,18,20-25,33-35,38-62 and 64-74 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>64-67 and 71</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,7,10-13,15,17,18,20-25,33-35,38-62,68-70 and 72-74</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. 						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal I	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3673

I

DETAILED ACTION

3

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37
- 5 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for
- 6 continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been
- timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR
- 8 1.114. Applicant's submission (previously submitted amendment filed August 1, 2003) filed on
- 9 August 1, 2003 has been entered.
 - 2. Upon further search and consideration, allowable subject matter indicated in the previous office action mailed on May 6, 2003, such as the limitations as recited in claims 33-35 and 38-47, has been withdrawn in view of the newly found reference to Dorel to US 6,047,784. New ground of rejection based on the newly found reference is as follows.

14

15

16

17

10

11

12

13

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

18 19

20

4. Claims 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

Art Unit: 3673

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Re claim 55: The claim is dependent upon claim 19 which has been canceled. It appears to be dependent upon claim 17 and has been treated as such. However, the limitation of claim 55 is similar to the limitation as recited in claim 17. It is suggested to be deleted to avoid redundancy.

Appropriate amendment is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23-25, 33-35, 38-52, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, 68-70

Art Unit: 3673

and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorel (US 6,047,784)

in view of Thomeer et al. '003 (US 5,828,003).

Dorel disclose an apparatus for directional drilling comprising: a coiled tubing/tube (20) which is a tube/string of tubular members, data transmission conductor/electrical control wireline (5); a drill bit/ a member of displacing formation (15); a bottom hole assembly (21) attached to the downhole to the string ans to the well apparatus/logging tool (18), the bottom hole assembly including a propulsion system/prime mover/drilling assembly (11) with a power section/mud motor (13) which is powered by the fluids circulating through the coiled tubing; a steering assembly/bend housing (12) with an electric motor (24) to adjust a bend angle with a universal joint (90), the direction of drilling can be altered by the operation of the bend housing serving as a three dimensional steering apparatus (see Figs. 1-4; col.3, lines 16-67; col.4, lines 1-67; col.5, lines 1-67; col.6, lines 1-67; col.7, lines 1-67; col.8, lines 1-33).

However, Dorel fails to disclose or fairly suggest the coiled tubing is a composite pipe including fibers wrapped in a predetermined pattern around the liner of the composite tube. Thomeer et al.'003 discloses a composite coiled tubing comprising of a liner (76, 91, 99) with a flowbore and layers of fibers (77-79, 92-95, 101-109) wrapped in a predetermined braided pattern around the liner (76, 91, 99), a number of power conductors (105, 107) as depicted in Fig. 6e and/or a conductor or fiber may be intrinsically manufactured in the composite coiled tubing (see col.11, lines 12-34 and col.12, lines 43-58) and the layers of fibers may carry axial/tensile loads to

Art Unit: 3673

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

the composite tubing; wherein a downhole assembly/tool (20) being connected to the composite tubing (see Figs. 1-29; col.6, lines 4-33; col.7, lines 12-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace Dorel's coiled tubing with the composite tubing as taught by Thomeer et al.'003 in order to enhance the axial/tensile resistance for the composite tubing and provide the space for flowing drilling fluid without interruption of the electric conductor lines.

With respect to the range of the modulus of elasticity, yield strain, yield stress of the composite tubing and the pulling force on the string by means of the propulsion system, an artisan within the ordinary skill in the art would have provided such a range as claimed in order to enhance the directional drilling capability and control.

7. Claims 3, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorel as modified by Thomeer et al.'003, as applied to claim 1, further in view of Williams et al. (US 5,913,337). The teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 have been discussed above.

However, the teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 fail to disclose the range of Young's modulus and density of the composite umbilical and a metallic conductor embedded in a wall of the composite umbilical. Williams et al.'337 disclose a spoolable composite tubular member with energy conductors comprising of a composite umbilical including non-metallic/fibers having a modulus of elasticity which is 100,000 psi or greater, and including the metallic

Art Unit: 3673

conductor (21) embedded in the wall of the composite umbilical (see Fig.11; col.3, lines 4-10; col.4, lines 25-34; col.12, lines 46-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the composite tube of Dorel, as modified by Thomeer et al.'003, by replacing with the composite umbilical tube having a metallic conductor and a desired modulus of elasticity as taught by Williams et al.'337 in order to enhance stiffness of the composite umbilical by providing a uni-directional longitudinal stiffening material in the opposite sidewalls of the composite umbilical and still provide a desired elasticity limit.

With respect to the density parameters for the composite umbilical, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided Dorel's tubing modified by Thomeer et al.'003 with a certain density in order to provide a tube that is light and easy to handle in spooling the composite umbilical.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

10

11

12

5

8. Claims 22, 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorel as modified by Thomeer et al.'003, as applied to claim 21, further in view of Colin et al.'145. The teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 have been discussed above.

However, the teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 fail to disclose a connector for connecting lengths of the pipe. Colin et al.'145 disclose a connection device for a cable incorporating optical fibers and metal conductors including the connector assembly as

Art Unit: 3673

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

depicted in Fig. 1 (see Figs.1-3; col.2, lines 1-35).

Therefore, in view of Colin et al.'145, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the composite tube of Dorel, as modified by Thomeer et al.'003 by adding the connector device between the end of the composite umbilical in order to efficiently provide the required length of the umbilical composite at the site.

9. Claims 53 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorel as modified by Thomeer et al.'003, as applied to claim 17 and 21 respectively, further in view of Wu (US 5,438,267). The teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 have been discussed above.

However, the teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 fails to disclose a resistivity antenna being connected to the electronic section of the bottom hole assembly. Wu discloses a bottom hole assembly including a processor/electronic section (51) having an resistivity antenna as receivers (22, 26) to measure the resistivity of the well (see Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 21-68; col.6, lines 1-20; col.8, lines 1-19).

Therefore, in view of Wu, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the bottom hole assembly of Dorel, as modified by Thomeer et al.'003 by adding the receiver and processor to the system in order to enhance the control of the bottom hole assembly.

Art Unit: 3673

10. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorel as modified by Thomeer et al.'003, as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Dismukes (US 4,646,856).

The teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 have been discussed above.

However, The teachings of Dorel modified by Thomeer et al.'003 fails to disclose or fairly suggest the string of tubular members engineered to cause the string to achieve neutral buoyancy in the fluids of the well and the specific density of the umbilical composites. Dismukes discloses tubulars for directional drilling comprising of drill string/conduit, the conduit including the cylinder designed to provide flotation to the conduit to cause it to be neutrally buoyant in drilling fluid of the well (see Figs. 7-10; col.5, lines 30-56).

Therefore, in view of Dismuke, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the composite tube of Dorel, as modified by Thomeer et al.'003, by including the cylinder in order to provide substantial neutral buoyancy to the umbilical in the drilling fluids.

14

15

16

17

18

19

10

11

12

13

3

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 17 and 21 (independent claims) have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, with respect to the argument for the Thomeer et al'003's composite coiled tubing which will stand compression loads by a tubing injector to prevent buckling so that it is

Art Unit: 3673

designed not for the tension loads but for the compression loads for the coiled tubing, the composite tubing of Thomeer et al'003 undergoes numerous bending events each item is run into and out of the wellbore and it goes into tubing injector for entry into the wellbore, each bending/buckling event is repeated in reverse when the tubing is later extracted (pulled) from the well bore as mentioned in col.6, lines 24-33 in Thomeer et al.'003.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 64-67 and 71 would be allowable over the prior art of record.

10 Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jong-Suk (James) Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308-6777. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 6:30AM to 3:00PM Monday thru Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather C. Shackelford, can be reached on (703) 308-2978. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

J. Lee /jjl

October 23, 2003

Jong-Suk (James) Lee Patent Examiner Art Unit 3673

21 22

23

3

5

6

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20